

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/813,436	(	03/31/2004	Kirti Srivastava	4062-117	4062-117 3805		
23117	7590	05/16/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
NIXON &		•	DESTA, ELIAS				
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			COOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,			2857			

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ob."	Application No.	Applicant(s)	10)
Advisory Action	10/813,436	SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elias Desta	2857	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	ss
THE REPLY FILED 24 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP			
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aband fidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 CFR	e, which R 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate inally set in the final Office	e extension fee action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the a	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOw);	TE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in befappeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>			e issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of lineary rej	coted cianns.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		ompliant Amendment (P	ΓOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment	canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an exp	planation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	. A la - C	-4i6 A  ill4 b	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is n	ecessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached	d.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			e because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	1
13. Other:		Maus Ho marc s. hof	
		MARC S. HOFF   SUPERVISORY PATENT EX TECHNOLOGY CENTER	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 5.The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter with no practical application (even if written in a method form). Law of nature and natural phenomena are the exceptions to statutory subject matter. For instance, "quantification of the earth's surface area heat flow" and "evaluation of the thermal state for related oil and natural gas" are governed by the thermodynamics law of nature and the claims do not exhibit a practical application. "An exponentially decreasing heat source and associated boundary conditions" actually are naturally occurring thermodynamics properties. Applicant is caught in between claims that are related to a mathematical expression describing thermodynamic properties and trying to make those claims statutory for purposes of examination. "Obtaining an expression for mean heat flow and variance in heat flow" does not produce concrete and tangible result. The invention "as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement, as stated in MPEP is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (see also Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).